

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 13-24, 27 and 28 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 13-15, 23, 27 and 28 are amended and Claims 11, 12, 25 and 26 are cancelled by the present amendment. Support for amendments of Claims 1, 9, 13-15, 23, 27 and 28 can be found, for example, in the claims as originally filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 15-28 are subject to a restriction requirement and withdrawn pending the allowance of linking Claim 11; Claims 1 is objected to as including informalities; Claims 2-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite; Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Muto (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0116480); and Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Muto in view of Parry (U.S. Pat. No. 6,666,594).

In response to the objection to Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended to include the preamble unintentionally left off in the last amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to Claim 1 be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claims 2-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejection. Specifically, with respect to Claims 2, 4, 7 and 9, Claim 1 has been amended and thus sufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in these claims now exists. With respect to Claims 1 and 9, the claims have been amended to recite sufficient antecedent basis for the limitations found therein. Further, with respect to Claim 1 (Claim 1 includes the features of Claims 11 and 12), Applicants respectfully note that although there is no explicit description about the link to the web page in the specification, one skilled in the art would recognize that click a URL leads to

a link to a web page. Thus, the URL found in the subject of the email is in fact a link to the web page.

Accordingly, in light of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-12 under §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Muto, the rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 describes an image reproducing apparatus. In a non-limiting example Figure 2 illustrates the invention as described in Claim 1. The image reproducing apparatus is designed to form and reproduce and images. If there is a problem with the reproduction or forming of images an acquiring unit 13 acquires the problem information. The problem is then sent to the addressee determination unit 14 which accesses the problem database 20 and identifies the problem code of the problem information and finds the addressee who is associated with that problem code. The addressee determination unit 14 then sends the information to the e-mail creating means which creates an e-mail using the above information. Finally, the communication unit sends the e-mail.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

a data storage that stores a plurality of possible problems occurring in connection with the image forming and reproducing process, each problem being stored in association with addressee information and problem ID code;

an acquiring unit that acquires problem information when one of the problems occurs in connection with the image forming and reproducing process;

an addressee determination unit that selects an addressee corresponding to said one of the problems with reference to the data storage...

a web page creating means that creates a Web page containing detailed information about the problems detected in an image reporting and reproducing process; and

an e-mail creating means that creates an e-mail to report the occurrence of said one of the problems to the selected addressee and inserts the problem ID code and a URL of the Web page in the subject of the e-mail.

Independent Claims 13, 14, 15, 27 and 28 recite similar features.

Muto describes a system in which transmission data is generated on a status change of a device. Further, Muto describes a mail header/footer unit that stores destination information<sup>1</sup> and status codes corresponding to a status message data unit.<sup>2</sup> However, Muto does not describe or suggest a plurality of possible problems occurring in connection with the image forming and reproducing process, each problem being stored in association with addressee information and problem ID code.

In other words, Muto describes status codes and sending status messages via an email. However, Muto does not describe or suggest that certain problems are associated with certain persons or addressees. Thus, Claim 1 describes an apparatus that correlates an address with a specific problem, allowing the right person to receive notification of the problem, while Muto does not.

Additionally, Muto does not describe or suggest inserts the problem ID code and a URL of a Web page, that provides detailed information about the problems detected, in the subject of the e-mail.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Muto does not describe all of the features recited in Claim 1 and thus Claim 1 patentably defines over Muto. Further, Parry does not cure the deficiencies of Muto as noted above.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 13-15, 27 and 28, and claims depending therefrom patentably define over the cited prior art.

Additionally, as Claim 11 has been cancelled and incorporated into Claim 1, Applicants submit that the linking features of Claim 11 are now incorporated into Claim 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> Muto, paragraph 0045.

<sup>2</sup> Muto, paragraph 0055.

Accordingly, in light of the above discussion regarding Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement of Claims 15-28 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)